DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 993 HE 011 896

AUTHOR Nelsen, William C., Ed.; Siegel, Michael E., Ed.
TITLE Faculty Development: Key Issues for Effectiveness. The Forum for Liberal Education, Volume II, Number 1, October, 1979.
INSTITUTION Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Oct 79
NOTE 13p.
AVAILABLE FROM Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Curriculum Development; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Inservice Education; *Institutional Characteristics; *Instructional Improvement; Organizational Change; *Professional Development; *Program Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

The impact and effectiveness of various faculty development programs is the focus of this report from the Association of American Colleges. Twenty faculty development programs around the country are examined. Faculty development is defined in this study as all activities designed to improve the performance of faculty as teachers, scholars, advisors, and contributors to campus life. Four major categories are presented: (1) professional development; (2) instructional development; (3) curricular change; and (4) organizational change. Each of the twenty programs are examined for their effectiveness in meeting the objectives of these four categories. The findings indicate that all but one of the colleges had specific new programs designed to enhance the professional growth of faculty. Programs aimed at the improvement of teaching were often the least successful. Programs that prepared faculty for curriculum change were relatively successful and few institutions gave attention to organizational change as a means of encouraging faculty development. The key factors of successful development programs included: clarity of purpose, careful planning, on-campus communication, program and personnel management, faculty knowledge of faculty development, program evaluation, individual and group activity, and variety and flexibility. An annotated bibliography is included. (SF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AAC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED177993

The Forum for Liberal Education

forum

October, 1979
Volume II Number 1

Guest Editors:

William C. Nelsen, *Director, AAC Project on Faculty Development, and Vice President and Dean, St. Olaf College*

Michael E. Siegel, *Assistant Director, AAC Project on Faculty Development, and Assistant Professor of Government, The American University*

Faculty Development: Key Issues for Effectiveness
William C. Nelsen 1

Professional Development 5

Instructional Development 6

Curriculum Change 8

Organizational Change 8

Additional Programs 9

Resources
Michael E. Siegel 10

aac
Association of American Colleges
1818 R Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

HE 011 894

Faculty Development

Faculty development has been a topic of great interest in the 1970s. With stable faculties and concern for quality, many colleges and universities have begun formal programs for enhancing the personal and professional development of faculty. As these projects have matured, the time has come to ask questions about impact and effectiveness.

With the support of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the Association of American Colleges has initiated such an evaluation, the AAC Project on Faculty Development. William C. Nelsen, Director, and Michael Siegel, Assistant Director, have taken a serious look at twenty faculty development programs around the country. With sixteen consultants, they interviewed faculty and administrators on these campuses. This issue of **Forum** *is a summary of their findings. Dean Nelsen's essay provides an overview of the results of the project, followed by capsule descriptions of specific campus activities rated by interviewers as especially helpful and effective. In each category, additional programs are also listed. The extensive annotated bibliography was prepared by Michael Siegel. The findings of this project should be helpful to all colleges and universities, public and private, concerned about continuing growth of faculty.*

Faculty Development: Key Issues for Effectiveness

by William C. Nelsen

During the past decade a great deal of effort and money have gone into the development and renewal of college and university faculty. Spurred on by the perception that faculty in most collegiate institutions were becoming increasingly stable or locked in, many institutions created new programs of faculty development, often with major support from foundations and the federal government.

Of course, most colleges and universities have always provided some support for faculty development, usually in the form of the more traditional sabbatical program, assistance for travel to professional meetings, and special leave arrangements. But in recent years a variety of new approaches has been attempted, designed to stimulate renewal of the faculty member in all aspects of his or her professional life—as teacher, scholar, adviser to students and contributor to campus life. With internal or external budget support, institutions have provided released time and summer study for research or course development, workshops and institutes focusing on new (and old) approaches to teaching, long-range faculty growth planning, centers for instructional development, internships in agencies beyond the academy, interdisciplinary symposia, new forms of student and peer evaluation, and a variety of other opportunities.

But have any or all of these approaches done any good? Have they made any noticeable difference in the lives of individual faculty? Have institutional programs improved as a result? Which approaches have been the most successful? Attempting to answer these questions is the major purpose of the AAC Project on Faculty Development.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT: PROGRAM CONTENT

What do we mean by faculty development? The term here refers to all those activities designed to improve the performance of faculty as teachers, scholars, advisers, and contributors to campus academic life. After reviewing the relevant literature and pilot testing our research design, we decided to divide faculty development activities into four major categories:

> *professional development*—scholarship, improved research skills, broadening of scholarly areas,
>
> *instructional development*—pedagogy, improved teaching skills, learning of new techniques,
>
> *curricular change*—introduction of new courses, significant changes in current offerings development of interdisciplinary courses,
>
> *organizational change*—introduction of new campus-wide goals, organizational changes designed to facilitate faculty renewal.

How successful were colleges at carrying out programs in these four areas? The chart below shows that, according to the interviewers' preceptions following extensive campus visits, colleges were most successful in developing and implementing programs in professional growth, moderately successful in the area of curriculum change, and usually much less successful in instructional development and organizational change.

Objective	*No. of Colleges Surveyed With Programs in Particular Area*	*Very Successful*	*Partially Successful*	*Unsuccessful*
Professional Growth	19	15 (79%)	4 (21%)	
Instructional Development	13	2 (15%)	6 (46%)	5 (38%)
Curricular Change	15	6 (40%)	5 (33%)	4 (26%)
Organizational Change	6		2 (33%)	4 (67%)

Some general observations about these four aspects of faculty renewal may be beneficial.

Professional Growth. All but one of the twenty colleges surveyed had specific new programs designed to enhance the professional growth of faculty. As the chart above demonstrates, most of these programs were relatively effective. This fact is not surprising. The most common approach to professional growth was a series of individual grants to faculty to pursue scholarly activities via summer study, released time, short-term travel to research centers, or longer-term special leaves. In most cases these funds allowed faculty to pursue individual research projects in which they were interested, to tackle new or related subject areas and to bring themselves up-to-date in their own fields.

For certain faculty such special opportunities are not new, especially for those few able to obtain nationally-recognized grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Science Foundation, the Research Corporation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and other sources. But the expansion of small on-campus grants has meant that many faculty have received special recogniton and funds for the first time in their academic lives. This support not only assisted scholarly development but also provided an important morale booster for many faculty.

Equally successful were professional growth programs in which faculty worked together in groups for scholarly purposes, studying a growing field of knowledge, tackling a problem in an interdisciplinary manner, and learning from colleagues more about the valuable perspectives of other disciplines. Such group experiences not only assisted individual scholarly development, but, in the view of many faculty also helped to enhance the general scholarly climate of the campus.

Instructional Development. Programs aimed at the improvement of teaching were often less successful. Why was this so?

Dealing directly with the subject matter of teaching has always been a very sensitive issue for college faculty. As one faculty member remarked during an interview, "Faculty are reluctant to think they can be told something about teaching." Others believe that good teachers are born not made or that teaching is so much a function of individual personality that little change can be accomplished. Does this mean that programs cannot be devised to assist faculty in their classroom teaching? Not at all, because a number of very useful programs were observed. Both interviewers and faculty pinpointed several important differences between successful and unsuccessful programs.

Many workshops or seminars on the improvement of teaching were much too general and amorphous. On the other hand, those which dealt with specific topics and the improvement of specific skills—leading discussions, using the computer in teaching, important considerations for the first day of a class, grading problems, use of media—were seen by faculty as more helpful. While some faculty may never bring themselves to participate in such activities, others have felt that they have been able to take with them specific new skills or ideas useful in their teaching.

Many approaches to the improvement of teaching have faltered because they were seen by faculty as too clinical in nature. Programs were run for those who needed improvement rather than by faculty and for faculty who wished to learn together by sharing teaching problems and new ideas. Other programs suffered from an overuse of educational jargon, a tendency to which those in education departments, often called upon to assist in teaching improvement worshops, need to be very sensitive. In fact most faculty, while aware of the expertise of education department personnel, seem to prefer to have the leadership for such programs come from other departments.

Finally, teaching improvement programs often suffered from too much concentration on teaching and not enough on learning. The works of Perry, Heath, Astin, Chickering, and others have taught us a great deal in recent years about differences among students in learning needs, styles, abilities, and propensities. Yet most faculty are unaware of these rich resources. Many faculty involved in workshops and seminars focusing on the improvement of learning found the experience less threatening than ones stressing pedagogy. At the same time they began to realize the implications for their own teaching styles and practices.

Thus, successful teaching improvement programs, while difficult to bring about, are not impossible. What is required is careful forethought, a good specific focus, and sensitive leadership.

Curriculum change. The interviewers discovered that faculty development programs which direct the energies of faculty toward preparation for curriculum changes can be relatively successful—in renewing both what is being taught and who is teaching. Faculty often benefited greatly from programs which encouraged them to revise significantly a current course, prepare to teach entirely new subject matter, or to work with colleagues in "repackaging" a department's curriculum or preparing a new interdisciplinary approach. A focus on curriculum change seemed to be most successful where the goals were clear and the right people had been selected to pursue them.

This approach seemed to lose effectiveness when curriculum itself loomed too large or when it replaced other important considerations for effective teaching and learning. For example, interviewers encountered several faculty who were very excited abut teaching in a new interdisciplinary area where their studies had led them. Yet these same faculty were often prevented from teaching the new subject because their own departments were concerned that they would not be able to cover all of the essential areas of the discipline. In addition, related departments feared their territory was being encroached upon. On the more positive side, the interviewers found departments that rotated courses regularly to ensure that faculty had an opportunity to teach in areas of strong and new interest.

Curriculum change can be an effective means of faculty development, especially when goals are clear, faculty are well prepared for new assignments, and individual desires have a chance for expression.

Organizational change. Readily apparent in the above chart is the small number of institutions who gave any attention to organizational change as a means of encouraging faculty development. Only six of the colleges surveyed had instituted some specific organizational adjustment designed to enhance faculty renewal on campus and most of these adjustments were relatively minor in scope.

Yet in the long run, organizational changes in the reward structure, the committee system, or personnel management could have more impact than any other approach to faculty development. Many faculty we interviewed pointed to the reward structure on their campuses as unclear. To what extent are sincere efforts at improving teaching as well as scholarly publications rewarded—or even noticed? Signs and signals from administrators, department chairpersons and even colleagues are usually taken seriously by faculty, but where these signs and signals are confusing, any positive impact is lost.

Likewise structural changes in the faculty committee system need to be given more attention in relation to faculty development. Having a group of respected faculty overseeing faculty evaluation and development from a prominent place in the campus governance structure is an important factor in building a positive attitude toward renewal on campus. Also, time for scholarly and teaching activities can be increased by reducing excessive and unnecessary committee involvement and by reorganizing secretarial, library, media and other support systems.

On virtually every campus we heard frequent complaints from faculty concerning the evaluation system. Most faculty understand the importance of, and indeed the necessity of, a good system of student and peer evaluation, but most thought that current evaluation systems were too inflexible and not reflective of their work. To be sure some self-indulgence and defensiveness were present in these faculty viewpoints, but the deeper problem still exists. An evaluation system that is not well-regarded will not be helpful in encouraging development and renewal. Moreover, many campuses did not seem to be examining carefully the relationship between faculty evaluation and faculty development. A good evaluation system which is fair, flexible, and respected can provide very helpful information for both individual and collective faculty development.

Taking a hard look at campus organizational matters, including reward structures, committee alignments, and evaluations systems, ought to be a vital part of any college's attempting to build a supportive climate for continuing faculty development.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT: PROCESS

In the AAC Project we have looked carefully, not only at the content of faculty development programs, but at process—*how* were programs designed and implemented. As one administrator remarked, "Innovations are not accepted on their merits." The interviewers discovered quickly that *how* a college carried out its faculty renewal program was equally as important, perhaps more important, than *what* it proposed to do. The following issues proved to be especially important in the process of campus faculty development programs.

Clarity of purpose. Interviewers noted that in several instances colleges failed to sort out their needs and purposes. Was there a real need to improve the scholarly climate of the campus or was there a need to look at alternative approaches to instruction, or both? To what extent should faculty development be controlled by curricular considerations? At whom were the various aspects of the program aimed? Failure to make the objectives clear often resulted in lost time and poor placement of resources.

Careful planning. In most cases where planning was brief and involved only a small handful of individuals, the faculty development program suffered. At one of two campuses where the traditon of faculty involvement in decision-making was not strong, it appeared to be acceptable for a few administrators to carry out the planning. But at most colleges, failure to involve a significant number of faculty in the planning process led to problems. Meaningful faculty involvement in planning often creates a feeling of ownership of and long-term commitment to the faculty development program.

On-campus communication. The interviewers found that lack of good communication (quite surprisingly, even on relatively small campuses) had a strong negative impact on a program. In many cases, program availability was clearly communicated, although on one campus a faculty member remarked to an interviewer, "Oh, do we have such a program?" Often, however, there was a real lack of information concerning the continuing involvement of faculty colleagues in the program. Where both opportunities for scholarly and teaching assistance and results of activities were reported frequently, faculty were stimulated more often to consider their own development needs. Where communication was poor this bandwagon effect was lost.

Program and personnel management. Not surprising to interviewers was the observation that the quality of pro-

gram and personnel management made an important difference in faculty development. Were leadership responsibilities clear? Were key administrators supportive of the program? Did they assume leadership where necessary, but become less directly involved where it was important for *faculty* leadership to emerge? Which faculty were given leadership roles? It is obviously crucial that program leaders are those faculty who are generally respected by their colleagues and are thoroughly supportive of the program.

Good personnel management has never been a great strength of the academy. We found many instances where faculty had not been given feedback on their evaluations, where they had been given no personal encouragement for further development, and where their talents had been improperly channeled. Presidents and deans are very important in giving leadership to and support for faculty development, but department and division chairpersons play equally important roles. However, most department heads are simply not trained in or attuned to good personnel practices. Some learn this new role quickly while others serve out their term primarily as general organizers and FTE counters. Fortunately, some campuses are beginning to realize the importance of the department chairperson role and are developing programs to prepare and assist them in personnel matters. Other campuses are taking advantage of regional department chairperson workshops organized by AAC and others.

Faculty knowledge of faculty development. During the campus visits, interviewers became increasingly aware of the lack of knowledge by faculty and some administrators of the various possible approaches to faculty development. This deficiency often means that faculty renewal is defined within a very narrow perspective; it also results in too much unproductive reinventing the wheel, with project leaders failing to learn from the successes and mistakes of others. Thus, for many campuses an important first step in starting or extending a faculty development program is to educate faculty as to the great variety of approaches to assist in their own renewal. This type of educational program may help faculty in both defining their own needs and extending their vision of possible projects and programs.

Program evaluation. "We are thinking of doing some evaluation at the end of the faculty development grant period." This was often the response to interviewers' queries about systematic evaluation of the campus program. Lack of serious evaluation of the college's faculty development program in certain cases allowed the continuation of unproductive activities. The visit by the outside interviewers and the feedback given to the colleges was, in several instances, the first serious, comprehensive evaluation produced. Yet it was clear that several campuses could have profited from mid-course corrections. Faculty development, precisely because it is a difficult and sensitive area in which to work, deserves periodic evaluation, and colleges that take time for this important matter will profit greatly.

Individual and group activity. In the long run, faculty development is a highly individualized matter, encouraging the intellectual and personal growth of individual faculty members. Thus it is not surprising that the most frequently used approaches to faculty development have been individually oriented: sabbatical leaves, professional travel, released time, individual small grants. At the same time, it is important to balance these individual approaches with group activity. Too much stress on individual activity tends further to alienate faculty from one another in settings in which departmentalization is already the order of the day. Some colleges have recognized that such corporate development activities as faculty learning and sharing in seminars and workshops, are not only effective and efficient ways of learning, but mechanisms with important side benefits as well. Faculty who had engaged in significant group projects often spoke of ways in which they had learned to know their colleagues better had gained new respect for them, and had come to view themselves as a part of a larger body of faculty—all with important contributions to make to learning and teaching. Moreover, group-oriented programs often reach a larger number of persons with a relatively small investment of funds. Also, sometimes faculty were pulled into group development activities who might have felt reluctant to apply for individual grants. Campuses would do well to examine carefully spending some of their faculty development funds for corporate activities.

Variety and flexibility in faculty development Just like students, faculty members differ in their interests and needs. Yet, this fact is often overlooked in designing programs for faculty renewal. Not all faculty will respond equally well to a single approach to development. Some faculty will respond aggressively to new opportunities for research and study while others will not. Some faculty will never take part in a discussion concerning new approaches to teaching; others will profit greatly from such an exchange. For many faculty, an individual grant is a great stimulus; for others, a group approach to development is more effective. In sum, those campuses that organized a multifaceted, flexible approach seemed to reach more faculty and to do so with more lasting effect.

These conclusions from the AAC Project on Faculty Development will provide no simple magic formulas. Yet, the above issues came sharply to the fore throughout interviews across twenty campuses and should provide useful reference points for those colleges beginning, continuing, or extending the increasingly important task of faculty renewal.

(Portions of this article are adapted from presentations made at two national conferences: the Gordon College Conference on Faculty Growth Contracts, June, 1979, and the Lilly Endowment Faculty Development Conference, June, 1979.)

Faculty Development: A Variety of Approaches

The following descriptions discuss briefly various successful approaches to faculty development. While most of these programs were studied in connection with the AAC Project on Faculty Development, other institutions' activities are mentioned as well.

Professional Development

Austin College
Career Development Program

The Austin College Career Development Program grew out of a faculty committee examination of alternatives to tenure. Although tenure has been retained, Austin now requires a five-year career development plan for all faculty and top administrators. Each plan is developed by the individual in consultation with colleagues or a consultant (a retired faculty member) and must be submitted to the divisional dean, provost, and president for approval. A faculty member cannot be considered for tenure, promotion, sabbatical or special individual development grant without a completed professional growth plan. Retention of tenure is conditional upon continued pursuit of the objectives in the growth plan.

Contact:
Dan Bedsole
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Austin College
Sherman, TX 75090
(214) 892-9101

Beloit College
Small Grant Program for Retraining Faculty

Grants ranging from $150 to $2,000 have been used to assist faculty to retool in certain areas in order that they might teach courses which they had not taught previously or for some time. Retrenchment at Beloit created gaps in the curriculum, requiring new teaching assignments. Most faculty undertook these new assignments willingly and appreciated the grant assistance allowing them to study at appropriate graduate centers. A committee of three faculty members advised the provost in awarding these grants. Examples include a religion professor doing graduate study in world religions, an English professor taking a Chaucer course for the first time in 30 years, a physical chemistry teacher moving into biochemistry and organic chemistry, and an economist undertaking management studies. Ironically, it was the necessity of retrenchment which allowed many of these faculty to move into areas of their extended interests.

Contact:
Zeddie Bowan
Provost
Beloit College
Beloit, WI 53511
(608) 365-4959

Colgate University
Senior and Junior Faculty Grants

Designed to stimulate new ideas and projects, senior faculty grants allow those faculty to take one semester off to study in unfamiliar areas of their disciplines. While most applications for these grants come from the faculty themselves, some individuals have been encouraged to pursue specific projects. As a result of these leaves, many senior faculty have been revitalized; for example, a religion professor became excited about the study of African Christian theology, while an English professor gained new interest in Asian literature. Some faculty have been able to link these leaves with a regular half-year sabbatical, thereby creating a full-year's leave at full pay.

Junior faculty development grants provide half-year leaves for non-terminal faculty who have successfully stood for a third-year review. Administered by the university's Research Council, the grants encourage junior faculty to start on new research projects beyond their dissertation areas.

Contact:
Robert Blackmore
Acting Dean
Colgate University
Hamilton, NY 13346
(315) 824-1000

Earlham College
Five-Year Review of Tenured Faculty

In 1975 Earlham inaugurated a required program of a five-year review for its tenured faculty. A three person faculty committee is selected by the faculty member to be reviewed, who then assembles a dossier that includes a self-evaluation, evaluation forms and letters from present and former students, letters from faculty colleagues, and other relevant documentation. The committee consults with the faculty member before, during, and after the dossier is prepared and then forwards its report to the dean (with a copy to the faculty member). The dean in turn meets with the faculty member to decide ways in which the college can assist in the continued professional growth of the faculty member.

Contact:
Joe Elmore
Provost and Dean of Academic Affairs
Earlham College
Richmond, IN 47374
(317) 962-6561

Furman University
Mid-Career Faculty Development Grants

This project, supported by funding from the Mellon Foundation, has provided 25 faculty with either full or partial support to supplement faculty members' sabbatical or regular salaries and enabled them to travel and conduct research. In order to qualify for these funds, faculty must be between the ages of 35 and 55 and have developed a five-year faculty growth plan, which is used as the basis for making the grants. In the first year of the program, 41 faculty applied for funding. Most faculty have found that the growth plan exercise was valuable in itself and recommended that it be done regardless of the availability of funding.

Contact:
John Crabtree
Academic Dean
Furman University
Greenville, SC 29613
(803) 294-3075

Hope College
Summer Fellowships and Dean's Discretionary Fund

Summer fellowships, with the assistance of outside funding, have provided stipends and expense funds for specific research projects. These awards have stimulated many faculty, especially in the humanities, to begin or return to research projects. As a result, these funds have produced new faculty enthusiasm for their work, more student involvement in research, increased interest in and preparation of outside grant proposals, and additional faculty publications. This type of small grant program, while common among many colleges, is especially noteworthy at Hope because of the careful administration of the program, its clear guidelines, and the reporting of project results back to the entire faculty by the dean and the faculty review committee.

The dean's discretionary fund was made possible by a foundation grant to enable support for faculty needs outside regular categories of funding. Previous uses of the fund have included support for programs, conference fees, speaker fees, publication costs, regular trips to other institutional libraries, acquisition of materials for teaching and research, and workshops on teaching and learning. Faculty have reacted positively to the support obtained from the fund and noted ways in which this has inproved the atmosphere on campus for faculty growth.

Contact:
David G. Marker
Provost
Hope College
Holland, MI 49423
(616) 392-5111

St. Lawrence University
Student Involvement Grants

Students seldom play a direct role in the professional development of faculty. St. Lawrence has a unique approach in which a committee of fifteen students accepts faculty proposals and awards grants approximately $500 in size and totalling $2,000 to $5,000 per year. All funds are raised by the committee, usually from off-campus sources. While the original focus was to provide assistance for pre-tenured, pre-doctoral faculty to complete their Ph.D. dissertations, the grant program has broadened to consider any faculty project that will clearly improve classroom or other teaching performance. The committee receives considerable help from the dean, but otherwise seeks information on grantees from faculty and other students.

Contact:
George H. Gibson
Vice President and Dean
St. Lawrence Univesity
Canton, NY 13617
(315) 379-5011

Instructional Development

Central Pennsylvania Consortium
New Faculty Institute

For several years this consortium (Franklin and Marshall, Gettysburg, Dickinson, and formerly Wilson College) has provided a four-day institute for new faculty. Ordinarily conducted by an outside consultant, the institute has allowed new faculty to explore the meaning and purpose of teaching and to examine important issues in approaches to classroom teaching. The institute has helped younger faculty make the transition from scholarly, discipline-oriented graduate school programs to college teaching.

Contact:
Beverly Eddy
Director, Central Pennsylvania Consortium
Dickinson College
Carlisle, PA 17013
(717) 243-5121

Earlham College
The Teaching Consultant

Earlham utilizes a faculty member to serve half time as a teaching consultant for other faculty. The consultant, who is formally appointed by the dean, is selected by a poll of faculty to determine the person they would most trust in this role. The teaching consultant counsels faculty, giving them feedback on individual teaching and professional

problems, providing support for faculty trying new teaching ventures, and generally assisting in other ways as needed. The teaching consultant is carefully insulated from the formal evaluation process and may not be a member of the Faculty Affairs Committee until at least three years after completion of the consultancy. During the first three years of this program more than 70 percent of the faculty have benefitted from the services of the teaching consultant.

Consultant:
Paul Lacy
Professor of English
Earlham College
Richmond, IN 47374
(317) 962-6561

Furman University

Experienced Faculty Assisting Younger Faculty

At Furman, a group of experienced faculty members has been serving as in-house consultants for younger faculty on teaching and learning. In the past year these faculty have inaugurated a series of seminars focused on such issues as lecturing, images of good teaching, leading discussions, and learning theory. While aimed at younger faculty, the seminars have attracted a number of senior participants as well. In a related program, Furman is instituting a formal program whereby several experienced teachers and new teachers will work together in a one-to-one, mentor-novice relationship. The two persons will observe one another's classes and share evaluations and ideas for improvement. It is anticipated that not only the novice teacher but also the senior faculty member will grow from this experience.

Contact:
John Crabtree
Academic Dean
Furman University
Greenville, SC 29613
(803) 294-3075

Gettysburg College

Writing Workshop

More and more colleges are beginning to see the importance of all faculty, not just those in departments of English, participating in the teaching of good writing. A writing workshop at Gettysburg prepared faculty to take on this important responsibility by assisting faculty with their own writing skills and by helping them to evaluate better their student's writing. Led by English professors from the college, the workshop was well attended by members of several different departments.

Contact:
James Pickering
Department of English
Gettysburg College
Gettysburg, PA 17325
(717) 334-3131

Lawrence University

One-to-One Classroom Teaching Consultant

This effort in faculty development came about almost accidentally. A retired, well-respected professor of theater was asked by the dean of the Music Conservatory to assist him with his style of teaching. The results were so positive that the idea expanded to other faculty in the Conservatory, and then to other departments in the college. The consultant sits in on the classes of individual faculty members for the ten-week term and offers weekly "private lessons." He does not try to demonstrate new teaching techniques, but instead teaches faculty how to present themselves in the classroom, giving attention to voice placement, diction, pitch levels, and overcoming the monotony of their voices. The consultant spots also any lack of preparation and helps faculty review carefully what they have prepared for a particular day. As a result, several members of the faculty (at both junior and senior levels) have become more confident about their teaching.

Contact:
Richard Warch
President
Lawrence University
Appleton, WI 54911
(414) 739-3681

Pomona College

Computer Workshop

Many faculty, particularly those in the humanities, have had little if any experience in the use of computers as research and instructional aids. When its faculty became aware of the usefulness of computers for these purposes, Pomona introduced a computer workshop to enable faculty to gain hands-on experience with computers and to realize the potential for use in instruction. The workshop, conducted by a professor of geology and a consultant from IBM, met once each week during the semester. In additon, faculty were given opportunities for individual assistance to gain facility with a computer.

Contact:
Donald B. McIntyre
Chairman, Department of Geology
Pomona College
Claremont, CA 91711
(714) 621-8000

Curriculum Change

Berea College

Summer Seminars and Study Grants for Interdisciplinary Teaching

Summer seminars, usually two weeks in length, have been conducted over the past four summers to improve faculty competence in areas outside their disciplines, particularly in support of four core courses: Issues and Values, Religions and Historical Perspectives, Man and the Arts, and Christian Faith in the Modern World. The seminars involved outside experts and facilitators, although the Man and the Arts seminar used only on-campus resources. The seminars were judged by most people to be successful in helping faculty gain new confidence and to overcome the apprehension of tackling new material.

Berea has also received foundation funds to support faculty half-year leaves for study in areas outside their regular disciplines as preparation for teaching in interdisciplinary programs. While this approach is more costly than on-campus development programs, these leaves have been successful because they are tied to the faculty members returning to teach specific interdisciplinary courses in the core curriculum.

Contact:
William Stolte
Dean of the College
Berea College
Berea, KY 40404
(606) 986-9341

Bowdoin College

Grants for Course Development

These grants have supported faculty members seeking to develop new, less traditional courses for the Bowdoin curriculum or to make significant changes in existing courses. Most of the funds have been used for travel expenses or for purchase of supporting material for the courses. Courses that have been developed include Women in the Americas, which compares women in Latin America and the United States, and Mythologies of Europe. Several faculty have indicated that these new courses would not have been developed without the stimulation of the specific grants.

Contact:
Alfred H. Fuchs
Dean of the Faculty
Bowdoin College
Brunswick, ME 04011
(207) 725-8731

Haverford College

Interdisciplinary Course Development

A number of interdisciplinary courses have been developed through the merger of two existing courses. As a new approach to the development of these courses, faculty from the existing courses attend each other's classes in order to understand the perspective each brings to the subject matter. These faculty then work together to develop an interdisciplinary syllabus that will best complement the major points from the two courses. An additional benefit to this approach has been the insights gained by some faculty through observation of their colleagues' classes.

Contact:
Thomas D'Andrea
Provost and Dean of the Faculty
Haverford College
Haverford, PA 19041
(215) 649-9600

Hope College

Summer Workshops for Senior Seminar Faculty

These workshops have brought together faculty involved in the Hope Senior Seminar, a course which merges questions of faith and learning. The workshops are four to five weeks in length, and utilize both outside resource persons in theology, ethics, and values, and local resources to encourage faculty to integrate faith and learning and to prepare them to handle questions of faith and ethics in relation to their own disciplines. As at other colleges with similar group experiences, important side benefits were noted: the excitement of interdisciplinary dialogue, the increase in collegiality, a new openness and trust among faculty, and the recruitment of new faculty leadership for the seminar.

Contact:
David Marker
Provost
Hope College
Holland, MI 49423
(616) 392-5111

Organizational Change

Colgate University

Faculty Development Council

Created to oversee the implementation of a foundation grant, the faculty development council is composed of eight faculty appointed by the dean. With an annual budget of approximately $15,000, the council has awarded small grants to faculty for the improvement of teaching. While the council originally saw its role as one of working with faculty and their ideas to improve teaching and revitalize the curriculum, the small number of faculty proposals prompted the council to take a stronger role by sponsoring workshops and inviting specific proposals for interdisciplinary curriculum development. Examples of these projects include the development of courses on women's studies, the integration of sciences and humanities, and Colgate University as an institution.

Contact:
Anthony Aveni
Chairman, Faculty Development Council
Colgate University
Hamilton, NY 13346
(315) 824-1000

Kenyon College
Summer Seminars for Faculty

The Kenyon seminars are intensive, two-week investigations of the liberal arts at the college, designed to overcome faculty compartmentalizaton and division. During the first two years in which they were held, the seminars focused on Kenyon's philosophy of educaton, the role of the faculty in providing that education, and the needs of the students. In the past two years the focus has shifted from "talking about" the liberal arts to concentrating on substantive issues of broad interdisciplinary interest. Three faculty members lead the seminars; nearly 80 percent of Kenyon's faculty have participated in the seminars since they began. As a result, faculty have noted greated individual scholarly development and increased appreciation for their colleagues.

Contact:
Bruce Haywood
Provost
Kenyon College
Gambier, OH 43022
(614) 427-2244

St. Lawrence University
The Academic Resources Board

The academic resources board, composed of nine present faculty members appointed by the president and chaired by a retired faculty member, is responsible for defining and carrying out faculty development programs at the university. Through a careful process of experimentation and evaluation (supported by a series of small grants), the board has created a more receptive attitude on campus for faculty development. At the end of this process the board produced a "Systematic Plan for Faculty Renewal," a report setting forth long-term priorities for faculty development.

Contact:
Alfred Romer
Department of Physics
St. Lawrence University
Canton, NY 13617
(315) 379-5011

Additional Programs

Professional Development

Coe College, Cedar Rapids, IA 52402
Faculty and Staff Professional Incentive Matching Fund
J. Preston Cole, Vice President and Dean of the College

Franklin and Marshall University, Lancaster, PA 17604
Program of Small Grants for Research and Study
Brad Dewey, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

Gordon College, Wenham, MA 01984
Faculty Growth Plans
Richard Gross, President

Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, MA 01075
Mellon Scholar Awards for Younger Faculty
Emily Wick, Dean of the Faculty

Occidental College, Los Angeles, CA 90041
Visiting Scholars Program; Summer Seminars
Richard Gilman, President

Pomona College, Claremont, CA 91711
Study Leaves; Faculty-Student Development Grants
Robert Voelkel, Vice President and Dean of the College

Instructional Development

College of Charleston, Charleston, SC 29401
Mini-Grants for Instructional Improvement
John Bevan, Vice President for Academic Affairs

Franklin and Marshall University, Lancaster, PA 17604
Writing Center
Sue Ellen Holbrook, Director

Great Lakes Colleges Association, Ann Arbor, MI 48103
Summer Teaching Institute
Donn Neal, Vice President, GLCA

Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60201
Center for the Teaching Professions
B. Claude Mathis, Director

St. Olaf College, Northfield, MN 55057
Teaching Learning Center; Advanced Writing Component Workshop
Harlan Foss, Acting Vice President and Dean

Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13210
Center for Instructional Development
Robert Diamond, Director

Curriculum Change

Bates College, Lewiston, ME 04240
Mellon Fellows for Departmental Renewal
Carl B. Straub, Dean of Faculty

Davidson College, Davidson, NC 28036
Humanities Core Revision
T.C. Price Zimmerman, Academic Dean

Denison University, Granville, OH 43023
Summer Course Development Grants
Lou Brakeman, Provost

St. Olaf College, Northfield, MN 55057
Departmental Challenge Grants
Harlan Foss, Acting Vice President and Dean

San Francisco State University, San Francisco, CA 94132
NEXA Program
Michael S. Gregory, Director

Organizational Change

Beloit College, Beloit, WI 53511
Career Exploration Related to Academic Disciplines
Zeddie Bowen, Provost

Claremont Colleges, Claremont, CA 91711
Interdisciplinary Holistic Teaching and Learning Project
Alvin M. White, Director

University of Puget Sound, Tacoma, WA 98416
Faculty Exchange
Gwen Clavedetscher, Assistant Director of Faculty Development

Taylor University, Upland, IN 46989
Training Department Chairpersons
Robert D. Pitts, Dean of the University

Resources

Faculty development is a multi-faceted human phenomenon. As such, it encompasses the professional growth of faculty, the improvement of their pedogogy, as well as their striving to fashion curricular changes and organizational improvements. It also relates to their growth and development as human beings, to the struggles they experience and the hopes that they have. There is no one "correct" or foolproof approach to faculty development. Accordingly, the literature suggested here reflects different dimensions of faculty development, cast in a flexible and absorbent conceptual mold.

Faculty Development: The Context

Freedman, Mervin (ed.). "Facilitating Faculty Development." *New Directions in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Vol. 1, 1973.
These essays are based on a study of faculty growth and development sponsored by the Wright Institute, with assistance from the U.S. Office of Education. The researchers interviewed over five-hundred faculty members from diverse campuses throughout the country, to ascertain how faculty perceived their own professional careers and developmental needs. In a cogent introductory chapter, the authors note the ambiguity and confusion attached to the contemporary faculty member's role, compared to the "well-trodden" paths and signposts that formerly directed his or her professional ways. Essays that follow address themselves to the need for faculty to carve out a professional identity which is sensitive to change, but also rooted in the faculty member's socialization experiences and personal strengths. The importance of individual differences among faculty is clearly illustrated in one chapter describing faculty conceptions of the teaching art and in another depicting the different reactions of faculty to non-traditional students. As well, one chapter outlines various "stages" of faculty development, and draws some very interesting parallels to the "stages" of student development discovered by William Perry and his colleagues at Harvard. Finally, the concluding essays tackle the question of how to go about faculty development.

Gardner, John. *Self-Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society*. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1965.
Gardner stresses the importance of self-renewal for all segments of society. As institutions and organizations age, they lose their original sense of vitality and exhibit increasing tendencies of rigidity. Individuals within organizations also display tendencies to stagnate. Consequently, Gardner says, we must design our institutions and our organizations in ways which will encourage individual renewal: "the development of skills, attitudes, habits of mind and the kinds of knowledge, understanding, and insight that will be the instruments of continuous growth."

Group for Human Development in Higher Education. *Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment*. New Rochelle: Change Magazine Press, 1974.
The title of this publication suggests its major concern: during an era of "retrenchment" in higher education—when funds become scarce, enrollments shrink, and faculty mobility all but disappears—neglect of faculty development could be disastrous. The authors target most of their comments at the teaching component of faculty development, and lament the absence of training programs for excellent teachers in higher education. Acknowledging the seriousness of the problem, they nonetheless offer various suggestions to improve faculty performance in teaching: special graduate degrees for teaching, teaching improvement centers, teaching workshops, and teaching evaluation methods. One of the more interesting suggestions they make is for graduate schools to broaden the traditional notion of what counts as an original contribution to knowledge. They add: "Neglect and distortion of undergraduate teaching are caused not so much by the widespread emphasis on research as by the narrowing of research rewards to what can most easily be published in disciplinary journals."

Faculty Development: The Need

Hodgkinson, H.L. "Adult Development: Implications for Faculty and Administrators." *Educational Record*, 55, (Fall, 1974).
Hodgkinson utilizes the growing literature on adult development, including the work of Daniel Levinson and Gail Sheehy, to describe the needs of faculty during different phases of their careers. Concepts such as the Dream, the Mentor, "Catch 30," becoming one's own man, middlescence, and restablization are related to how faculty and administrators view and actualize themselves in their professional roles and the conflicts and crises they have at various stages of their professional lives. His ideas suggest that faculty development focus not only on *programs*, but also on *people*.

Wheeler, Burton M. "Hope and Despair in the Academy," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 15, 1978.
Wheeler laments the despair that has set in among many faculty members and urges them instead to project a sense of hope to their students. He enumerates the reasons for faculty despair, stressing the particular problem of a gulf between faculty and student cultures. Nonetheless, he charges faculty to overcome despair, and avers that it is primarily faculty who are responsible for establishing the ambience of the university.

Light, Donald. "Thinking About Faculty." *Daedalus*, 103, (Fall, 1974).
According to Light, only about 20 percent of faculty members in the U.S. regularly publish articles or books. Thus, by our very rigid and narrow standards only about 20 percent of faculty are "successful." Light urges that we evolve a more flexible conceptualization of success in academia, and provide at least as many paths to distinction as exist, for example, in the legal profession. He notes poignantly that most faculty would like to spend more time on teaching-related activities, but are prevented from doing so by the existing reward structures in many universities and colleges. Thus, faculty development programs ought to focus on methods of expanding the academy's definition of success.

Faculty Development: The Range

Bergquist, W.H. and Phillips, S.R. "Components of an Effective Faculty Development Program." *Journal of Higher Education*, 46, (March/April 1975).
According to the authors the most widely used past approaches to faculty development—reduction of student/faculty ratios, the purchase of instructional equipment, and the recruitment of new Ph.D.'s with supposedly fresh ideas—are no longer adequate to meet the challenges of our times. They advocate a comprehensive approach to faculty development, embracing personal, instructional and organizational development. Their model assumes that changes must occur at the levels of attitude, process, and structure.

Centra, John A. *Faculty Development Practices in U.S. Colleges and Universities*. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1976.
This report of a national survey of faculty development activities contains information about frequency and effectiveness of various practices, the extent to which faculty are involved, and the organization and funding of programs. Centra reports that about half the institutions have faculty development activities, that the average age of such programs is a little over two years, and that the faculty most actively involved are good teachers who want to improve.

Gaff, Jerry C. *Toward Faculty Renewal: Advances in Faculty, Instructional, and Organizational Development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.
Gaff defines faculty development as "enhancing the talents, expanding

the interests, improving the competence, and otherwise facilitating the professional and personal growth of faculty members, particularly in their roles as instructors." He isolates three different dimensions of faculty renewal: 1) faculty development, including expanding the range of faculty knowledge in terms of subject matter, improving faculty knowledge about higher education, attending to the effective needs of faculty, and expanding faculty knowledge about student development; 2) instructional development, including utilizing innovations and pedagogical approaches, and applying known principles of learning theory to classroom instruction; 3) organizational development, implying that faculty get more involved with the total institution. Gaff reviews many of the programs in faculty development and provides a good list of the major centers of activity throughout the country.

Faculty Development: The How

Bergquist, William H. and Phillips, Steve R. *A Handbook for Faculty Development.* Vol. I. Washington: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1975. Vol. II, 1977.
In these two volumes Bergquist and Phillips describe activities that have been used for instructional, organizational, and personal development. They provide useful exercises for those interested in starting faculty development programs, and for those interested in improving their own teaching performance. As well, they provide good bibliographic information for different aspects of faculty development.

Gaff, Jerry G. (ed.) "Institutional Renewal Through the Improvement of Teaching." *New Directions in Higher Education.* Vol. 6. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.
This is a concise report on the Project on Institutional Renewal Through the Improvement of Teaching, a three-year effort which involved sixteen colleges and universities in a common search for ways to improve teaching and revitalize institutions. This volume includes reports from on-campus PIRIT project directors at a medium-sized university, a large university, and a small liberal arts college. The final four chapters include a discussion by Gaff on how to overcome faculty resistance, a discussion of involving students in faculty development (an often overlooked consideration), and a very useful tabulation of the benefits of faculty members as seen by faculty involved in the PIRIT programs.

Gaff, Sally Shake, Festa, Conrad and Gaff, Jerry G. *Professional Development: A Guide to Resources.* New Rochelle: Change Magazine Press, 1978.
According to the authors, it often comes as a surprise to faculty members to discover that there is a professional literature on higher education. Since most academics are never exposed to this body of knowledge, the authors have provided an accessible, inexpensive resource containing published materials and resource organization on professional development in academia. Each chapter begins with a brief essay which gives perspective on the given topic (i.e., Faculty and Teaching, Students and Learning, Course Development), raises key issues, identifies major trends, and concludes with a comprehensive, annotated bibliography on that same topic.

Lindquist, Jack (ed.) *Designing Teaching Improvement Programs.* Washington: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1979.
Lindquist provides summaries of ten different approaches to faculty development; for each approach he charts accompanying teaching improvement objectives along with specific activities relevant to the accomplishment of those objectives. Chapters include a review of the literature on the teaching-learning process, and discussions of faculty development at the liberal arts college level, the role of the university center in faculty development, staff development for community colleges, faculty development in the nontraditional setting, and professional development in the interinstitutional setting.

Nelsen, William C. "Faculty Development: Prospects and Potential for the 1980's." *Liberal Education.* 65, (Summer, 1979).
Noting that faculty development will continue to assume a very prominent position on the agenda of colleges and universities during the 1980's, Nelsen makes six suggestions for faculty and administration. The suggestions emerge from a close examination of thirty-three faculty development programs, from a review of the literature, from on-site observations, and from "hardnosed experiences of six years as an academic dean." The suggestions are as follows: 1) faculty development programs must be flexible and sensitive to the individual differences among faculty; 2) individual approaches however, must be balanced by corporate or collegial activity which takes into account broader institutional goals; 3) the definition of scholarship must be expanded to facilitate intellectual contributions from a wide range of faculty members to the broader academic community; 4) personnel management techniques at the academy must be improved; 5) faculty should familiarize themselves—or be encouraged to do so—with the burgeoning and important literature on student development; 6) administrators must take a strong leadership role in faculty development

Additional Resources

Exchange. Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development in Higher Education, Kansas State University
This is a quarterly newsletter which contains short descriptions about the Center's own activities, it being one of the most active centers for the promotion of effective faculty evaluation procedures. *Exchange* usually contains valuable reviews of books on faculty development, as well as announcements about upcoming activities and conferences related to faculty development.

For more information, contact:
Exchange
Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development in Higher Education
1617 Anderson Avenue
Box 3000
Manhattan, KS 66502

Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education
A quarterly newspaper which reports on both empirical and experiential studies on faculty development. Frequently, program directors reflect on specific aspects of local faculty development programs. As well, there are also articles related to themes in faculty development, such as evaluation techniques, fellowship programs for faculty, student development, and faculty advising. The newspaper also advertises important upcoming conferences related to faculty development.

For more information, contact:
Dr. Albert B. Smith
Editor
Faculty Development and Evaluation Newspaper
3930 N. W. 35th Place
Gainsville, FL 32605

Improving University Teaching
There have now been five international conferences on Improving University Teaching. For each conference, over two hundred papers were prepared by educators throughout the world. Many of the papers deal with the specific issue of faculty development from an international perspective. One can read about faculty evaluation problems in England, a new faculty development program in Hong Kong, resistance to faculty development in Brazil, faculty plans in Canada and many other interesting articles as well. Many of the contributors are Americans; they typically write in an applied, non-theoretical fashion about the process of faculty development in American colleges and universities.

For more information, contact:
Dr. Benjamin Massey
Improving University Teaching
University of Maryland University College
University Boulevard at Adelphi Road
College Park, MD 20742

Professional and Organizational Network in Higher Education
This is a professional association of people who share a commitment to improving higher education. Typically, they are engaged in faculty, administrative, instructional, or organizational efforts. Members share the belief that the teaching-learning process and institutional life in general are strengthened as opportunities for professional and personal growth are opened up to all members of the higher education community. POD currently offers an array of activities, including an annual conference, a quarterly newsletter, and national and regional training workshops.

For more information, contact:
Lance Buhl
Executive Director, POD
1836 Euclid Avenue, Suite 203
Cleveland, OH 44115

Forthcoming

Nelsen, William C. *Renewing the Teacher-Scholar.* (tentative title)
What does the model of the "teacher-scholar" mean on college campuses today? At many colleges implicitly or explicitly faculty development programs are aimed at improving the faculty member as both teacher and scholar. Drawing upon more than five hundred personal interviews with faculty members around the country, the author examines various approaches to renewing faculty, looking at both the content of renewal programs and important issues in planning and implementing such programs. He makes a special plea for a new approach to more meaningful scholarship, especially in the social sciences and humanities and concludes with challenges to both faculty and administrators in supporting each other's renewal efforts.

Nelsen, William C. and Siegel, Michael E. (ed.) *Effective Approaches to Faculty Development.* Washington: Association of American Colleges, 1980.
This book will summarize the major findings of the Association of American Colleges' Project on Faculty Development. That project entailed visits to 20 leading liberal arts colleges to assess the impact of faculty development on these campuses. At each campus extensive interviews were conducted with faculty, administrators and, in some cases, students. The editors have invited essays from faculty and administrators who have been directly involved in demonstrably exciting and effective programs in faculty development on their own campuses. Also, the editors have invited essays from faculty whose careers have been enhanced by their faculty development activities, and who are willing to share their feelings on renewal and revitalization with others. Siegel and Nelsen will also develop some analytical essays in which the focus will be on factors which seem to correlate with successful faculty development efforts.

The Forum for Liberal Education

Volume II, No. 1

Kathryn Mohrman, *Editor*
John W. Hager, *Assistant Editor*
Wayne H. Hoffmann-Ogier, *Research Assistant*

aac

The *Forum for Liberal Education* is a topic-oriented publication featuring a subject of importance for liberal education in each issue. It does not endorse or evaluate institutional activity. Rather, it describes various ways in which institutions of higher learning address important common concerns. Upcoming issues of the *Forum* will look at general education, career education, academic advising, new ways of teaching the natural sciences, and the creative arts in the liberal arts curriculum. Contributions of program information from *Forum* readers is encouraged.

The *Forum for Liberal Education* is published eight times during the academic year by the Association of American Colleges. The *Forum* is available at a subscription rate of $12 per academic year for persons at AAC member institutions, and $18 for all others. Copies of back issues and rates for multiple subscription orders are available upon request. Please address all correspondence, inquiries, and subscription orders to

FORUM
Association of American Colleges
1818 R Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009
(202) 387-3760